

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 22, 2009 (the “*Office Action*”). Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are pending and rejected. Applicant previously canceled Claims 8 and 11 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

#### **Deficiencies of the Office Action**

##### **i. The Office Action improperly cites to multiple columns and figures**

At the outset, Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action fails to identify the specific elements of the cited reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525 issued to Johnson et al. (“*Johnson*”), that the Office Action equates with several elements of the rejected claims. For example, in addressing several elements of the present claims, the Office Action cites to multiple whole columns and multiple figures of *Johnson* with no explanation as to how or what portion of the referenced columns or figures discloses the relevant elements. *See, e.g.*, Office Action, p. 6.

Applicant respectfully notes that citing whole columns and/or figures as disclosing multiple, distinct elements of several different claims without any explanation as to how the cited portions are relevant is not appropriate. Applicant respectfully notes that “[w]hen a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on *must be* designated as nearly as practicable.” 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2), emphasis added. The Office Action’s failure to do so here limits Applicant’s ability to fully distinguish the cited reference and runs contrary to the principles of compact prosecution. *See* M.P.E.P. § 707.07(g); M.P.E.P. § 2106(II). Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that, if the Examiner continues to utilize *Johnson* in rejecting any of the claims of this Application, the Examiner identify the specific elements of *Johnson* the Examiner equates with the elements of any rejected claims in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) and M.P.E.P. §§ 707.07(g) and § 2106(II).

##### **ii. The Office Action improperly paraphrases Applicant’s claims**

Additionally, at various places throughout the Office Action, the Examiner improperly paraphrases Applicant’s claims. As one example, in addressing Claim 1, the

Office Action asserts that “[t]he steps of (i)-(v) are merely steps involved in monitoring and reporting a business performance and these are inherently including [*sic*] in the accessing the information, monitoring and analyzing and marketing of data . . .” Office Action, p. 7. Applicant respectfully disputes this assertion and any other paraphrasing of the claimed subject matter to the extent such paraphrasing is inconsistent with the language of the relevant claims. Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (citing *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). Thus, it is improper to paraphrase elements or omit claim terms for purposes of comparing the language of a claim to the teachings of cited art. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner, as required by the M.P.E.P., base any future rejections on the language of the relevant claims and not any paraphrasing thereof.

iii. The Office Action fails to address Applicant’s arguments from previous responses

Additionally, Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action fails to substantively address the arguments Applicant presented in Applicant’s previous Response to Office Action filed September 29, 2008 (“Previous Response”). In the Previous Response, Applicant responded to the Examiner’s contention that Claims 2-6, and 13 “are considered as non-functional descriptive material.” Office Action, p. 10-11. Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that “[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the Applicant’s argument and answer the substance of it.” M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f) (emphasis added). Failing to address the substance of Applicant’s arguments limits Applicant’s ability to advance prosecution in this case, and runs contrary to the principles of compact prosecution. See M.P.E.P. § 707.07(g); M.P.E.P. § 2106(II). Applicant requests that, if the Examiner intends to maintain any of the present rejections, the Examiner address the substance of Applicant’s arguments with respect to the present rejections as required by M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f).

Moreover, Applicant further responded to the Examiner’s assertion that “the limitations are considered as non-functional descriptive material (NFDM)” in Applicant’s Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed October 29, 2008 (“Pre-Appeal Brief”). Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that the Examiner was unsuccessful during Pre-

Appeal on this matter. Accordingly, the relevant claims do not include “non-functional descriptive material” and are allowable.

Additionally, in the Previous Response, Applicant responded to the Examiner’s contention that claims 1, 9, and 10 include elements that are “inherently including [*sic*] in the accessing the information, monitoring and analyzing and marketing of data including the tracking of the key performance indicators.” As explained above, M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f) requires the Examiner to answer the substance of Applicant’s argument. The Office Action’s failure to address the substance of Applicant’s arguments limits Applicant’s ability to advance prosecution in this case, and runs contrary to the principles of compact prosecution. *See* M.P.E.P. § 707.07(g); M.P.E.P. § 2106(II). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner answer the substance of Applicant’s arguments as laid out in the Previous Response, or withdraw the rejection.

As a result, because the Office Action fails to point out with specificity which particular portions of the cited art allegedly disclose Applicant’s claims, improperly paraphrases Applicant’s claims, and fails to address the substance of Applicant’s arguments presented in the Previous Response, the Office Action is deficient and the rejections are improper. If the Examiner chooses to maintain any of the present rejections without addressing the deficiencies noted in the Previous Response and below, Applicant reserves the right to request a pre-appeal review of any such rejections, to appeal such rejections, to petition the Director for reconsideration of such rejections, and/or to pursue any other appropriate remedy.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-7, 12-13 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 1 recites “displaying the determined value of the key performance indicator *via a contextual visualization interface*” (emphasis added). Thus, the method of Claim 1 is “tied to a particular machine.” Applicant additionally notes that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences recently held that “a computerized method which includes a step of outputting information from a computer . . . are tied to a particular machine or apparatus,” and therefore contain patentable subject matter. *See Ex Parte Dickerson*, Appeal Number 2009-001172, July 9, 2009, p. 16 (available at

<http://des.uspto.gov/Foia/ReterivePdf?system=BPAI&fINm=fd2009001172-07-09-2009-1>).

Therefore, for at least this reason, the method recited in Claim 1 constitutes statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 according to the applicable case law. Claims 2-7, and 12-13 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-7, 9-10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525 issued to Johnson et al. (“*Johnson*”), in view of Internet documents entitled “Oracle Delivers Global Sales and Marketing Analysis to the Web” (“*Oracle*”) or “PeopleSoft Announces Balanced Scorecard for Strategic Decision-Making” (“*PeopleSoft*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least several reasons, as discussed further below.

For example, Claim 1 recites:

A method for reporting a value of a key performance indicator comprising:  
receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor;  
identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator;  
receiving a business event message indicating an occurrence of the business event, the business event message including business data describing the business event;  
in response to receiving the business event message, electronically determining the value of the key performance indicator based on the business data; and  
displaying the determined value of the key performance indicator via a contextual visualization interface.

#### **i. “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor”**

The proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Peoplesoft* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of Claim 1. As the Office Action concedes, *Johnson* fails to disclose any of the elements recited in Claim 1 in their entirety. Office Action, p. 7. In particular, *Johnson* fails to disclose “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor.” In an attempt to remedy these deficiencies in *Johnson*, the Office Action proposes combining *Oracle* with *Johnson*. As noted above, the Office Action fails to identify the specific elements of *Oracle* that the Office Action equates with the elements of

the rejected Claim 1 missing in *Johnson*. Instead, the Office Action alleges that “[t]he software provides global access to real time business monitoring information such as sales, forecasting, marketing trends and internet click-stream data to enhance a company’s customer intelligence.” Office Action, p. 7. Even assuming the Office Action’s characterization of *Oracle* were correct, this statement does not explain how, or even assert that, *Oracle* discloses “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor,” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added), and the cited portion of *Oracle* does not disclose this element. Thus, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination fails to disclose “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor,” as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, the Office Action alternatively attempts to remedy the deficiencies in *Johnson* by proposing to combine *Peoplesoft* with *Johnson*. As with the Office Action’s citation to *Oracle*, the Office Action fails to identify the specific elements of *Peoplesoft* that the Office Action equates with the elements of the rejected Claim 1 missing in *Johnson*. The Office Action merely asserts that *Peoplesoft* “teach[es] a business monitoring and management application and integrated cause-and-effect perspective on key management processes by providing the capabilities necessary to design and monitor critical success factors and calculate KPI to help managers develop and execute organizational strategy.” Office Action, p. 8. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Office Action’s characterization of *Peoplesoft*, the Office Action fails to even assert that *Peoplesoft* discloses “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor,” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added), and the cited portion of *Peoplesoft* does not disclose this element. As a result, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Peoplesoft* combination fails to disclose “receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor.”

ii. “identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator.”

As another example, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Peoplesoft* combination fails to disclose “identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator.” As explained above, the Office Action improperly paraphrases this element of Claim 1. The Office Action asserts that Claim 1 recites “identify[ing] a business event affecting the value of the business process.” Office Action, p. 5. Claim 1 recites “identifying

at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator” (emphasis added). Notwithstanding the Office Action’s misstatement of this element, the Office Action appears to rely on *Johnson* col. 32, ll. 46-56 in addressing this element of Claim 1. However, the mere fact that, according to *Johnson* “a sales event such as the introduction of a new incentive program for a specified product may occur” does not mean that *Johnson* discloses “identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator” (emphasis added). Attempting to remedy this deficiency in *Johnson*, the Office Action proposes combining *Johnson* with *Oracle*. As noted above, the Office Action fails to identify the specific elements of *Oracle* that the Office Action equates with the elements of the rejected Claim 1 missing in *Johnson*. Even assuming, however, that *Oracle* discloses any “key performance indicators,” the Office Action fails to explain how any alleged “key performance indicators” disclosed in *Oracle* are involved with “identifying at least one business event,” or how any alleged “business event” identified in *Johnson* is “associated with the selected key performance indicator” (emphasis added). Thus, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination fails to disclose “identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator,” as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action alternatively attempts to remedy the deficiencies in *Johnson* by combining *Peoplesoft* with *Johnson*. The Office Action asserts that *Peoplesoft* “teach[es] a business monitoring and management application and integrated cause-and-effect perspective on key management processes by providing the capabilities necessary to design and monitor critical success factors and calculate KPI to help managers develop and execute organizational strategy.” Office Action, p. 8. Even assuming that *Peoplesoft* discloses any “key performance indicators” as recited in Claim 1, the Office Action again fails to explain how any alleged “key performance indicators” disclosed in *Peoplesoft* are involved with “identifying at least one business event,” or how any alleged “business event” identified in *Johnson* is “associated with the selected key performance indicator” (emphasis added). As a result *Peoplesoft* fails to disclose this element of Claim 1. Accordingly, the proposed *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combination fails to disclose every element of Claim 1.

Moreover, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* and *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combinations are improper. Applicant respectfully notes that, for an obviousness rejection to be appropriate, the Office Action must “identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does.”

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1742 (2007). “[A] patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art.” *Id.* The Office Action’s explanation for combining the cited references fails to satisfy this requirement. As the sole motivation to combine *Johnson* and *Oracle*, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of *Johnson* by using other business monitoring parameter, i.e. key performance indicator, for monitoring a business process with respect to a business event instead of forecasting or trend or analyzing market value as taught by *Oracle* as mere [sic] using other similar financing parameters to monitor the desired business process to achieve similar business event monitoring result.” The Office Action’s conclusory assertion – that “it would have been obvious to modify . . . *Johnson* . . . for monitoring a business process with respect to a business event instead of forecasting or trend or analyzing market value” – does not identify any reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field or fields to combine the identified elements of *Johnson* and *Oracle*. Applicant respectfully notes that *Johnson* describes a system that “may continually evaluate and track events and actions which predict outcome.” *Johnson*, col. 35, ll. 20-22. The Office Action’s proposed reason for combining the references—to “monitor[] a business process with respect to a business event instead of forecasting or trend or analyzing market value”—is a benefit already provided by Johnson itself. Moreover, even assuming the Office Action is correct that *Johnson* teaches “forecasting or trend or analyzing market value,” the Office Action provides no evidence that *Oracle* provides any additional benefit that a person skilled in the art would be motivated to use “instead of forecasting or trend or analyzing market value,” as the Office Action claims (emphasis added). Accordingly, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the references for the reason stated by the Office Action. *See KSR Int'l*, 127 S. Ct. at 1742. The proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination is therefore improper for at least these reasons.

With respect to the Office Action’s alternative rationale for combining *Oracle* with *Johnson*, the Office Action states that “[i]t would have been obvious to modify the teachings of *Oracle* . . . for an improved system for automatically facilitating a sale opportunity or a new event in the sales process.” Office Action, p. 8. Applicant respectfully notes that this is also a benefit already provided by Oracle itself. *Oracle* describes a system that “combines built-in sales and marketing intelligence with a central, integrated information source, and

comprehensive Internet-based analysis . . . and enabl[es] [users] to aggressively manage business and market opportunities by harnessing the power of multidimensional analysis.” *Oracle*, p. 2, ¶ 2 (emphasis added). Thus, a person skilled in the art would have no motivation to combine any alleged benefits provide by *Johnson* with the system of *Oracle*. The proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination is therefore improper for at least these reasons.

With respect to the proposed *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combination, Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action cites identical rationales for the proposed combination as cited in the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination. Thus, for reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination, a person skilled in the art would have no motivation to combine the system of *Johnson* with the system of *Peoplesoft*, as proposed by the Office Action. The proposed *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combination is therefore improper for at least these reasons.

As a result, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* and *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combinations fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1. Additionally, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* and *Johnson-Peoplesoft* combinations are improper. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Although of differing scope from Claim 1, Claims 9 and 10 are allowable for at least analogous reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 9, and 10, and their respective dependents.

### **Dependent Claims 7, 12 and 13**

Claims 2-7 and 12-13 depend from Claim 1, which has been shown above to be allowable, and are allowable for at least this reasons. Additionally, several dependents of Claim 1 include additional elements not disclosed by the cited references and/or are allowable for additional reasons.

#### **i. Claim 7**

As one example, Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Johnson*, in view of *Oracle* and *Battat*. The proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Peoplesoft-Battat* combination, however, fails to disclose additional elements of Claim 7. Claim 7 recites “[t]he method of Claim 1, wherein the key performance indicator is a prediction, and the step of determining includes applying predictive logic to the business data” (emphasis added). In addressing this element of Claim 7, the Office Action does not



cite to a specific portion of any cited reference, and merely asserts that “this is fairly taught in *Cognos* or *Peoplesoft* or *Oracle*, as described above.” Office Action, p. 14. Applicant respectfully notes that “[w]hen a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable.” 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2), emphasis added. The Office Action’s failure to do so here limits Applicant’s ability to fully distinguish the cited reference and runs contrary to the principles of compact prosecution. See M.P.E.P. § 707.07(g); M.P.E.P. § 2106(II). Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that, if the Examiner continues to reject Claim 7, the Examiner identify the specific elements of the relevant reference the Examiner equates with the elements of Claim 7 in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) and M.P.E.P. §§ 707.07(g) and § 2106(II). Accordingly, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Peoplesoft-Battat* combination fails to recite “[t]he method of Claim 1, wherein the key performance indicator is a prediction, and the step of determining includes applying predictive logic to the business data.” Claim 7 is therefore allowable for at least this additional reason. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 7.

ii. Claim 12

As another example, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination fails to disclose additional elements of Claim 12. Claim 12 recites:

The method of Claim 1, further comprising:  
determining whether to request additional information about the  
business event based at least in part on the business data included in the  
business event message;  
requesting the additional information from an information provider;  
and  
wherein electronically determining the value of the key performance  
indicator comprises electronically determining the value based at least in part  
on the business data and the additional information.

Essentially conceding that the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination fails to disclose each of these elements, the Office Action proposes combining *Johnson* and *Oracle* with *Cline*. In addressing each of these elements of Claim 12, the Office Action cites to multiple columns and figures in *Cline*, including cols. 2-3, 13, 15, ll. 1-30, col. 17, l. 60 - col. 8, l 20, cols. 29, 30 and 30-34. As Applicant explained above citing multiple whole columns and/or figures as disclosing multiple, distinct elements of several different claims without any

explanation as to how the cited portions are relevant is not appropriate. With respect to the rejections, as one example, *Cline* fails to disclose “[t]he method of Claim 1, . . . wherein electronically determining the value of the key performance indicator comprises electronically determining the value based at least in part on the business data and the additional information.” In the cited portion, *Cline* simply discloses “an airborne flight planning system that utilizes data transmission facilities from the aircraft to ground to permit the flight crew to obtain updated weather information or generate either a different flight plan or the update of an existing flight plan.” The Office Action fails to explain how any portion of *Cline* discloses any “value of the key performance indicator” or any manner of “electronically determining the value of the key performance indicator based at least in part on the business data and the additional information.” As a result, *Cline* fails to disclose this additional element of Claim 12.

Moreover, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Cline* combination is clearly improper. As noted above, for an obviousness rejection to be appropriate, the Office Action must “identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1742 (2007). “[A] patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art.” *Id.* The Office Action’s explanation for combining *Cline* with *Johnson* and *Oracle* or *Peoplesoft* fails to satisfy this requirement. As the sole motivation to combine these references, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of *Johnson* . . . to effectively and continuously monitor the process (aircraft) progress, and, if necessary or desirable, update or change the process performance (flight) plan, as indicated above.” Office Action, p. 12. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Office Action’s characterization of *Cline*, this conclusory assertion merely restates a benefit allegedly provided by *Cline*, without explaining why a person having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine a “sales force automation system” disclosed in *Johnson* with the “flight plan system” of *Cline*. Moreover, *Johnson* fails to disclose any “aircraft progress.” A person of ordinary skill in the art of “sales force automation,” therefore would not be motivated to combine the *Johnson* system with *Cline* to incur any benefit allegedly provided to “aircraft progress” by *Cline*. As a result, the combination is improper for at least these reasons.

As a result, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Cline* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose additional elements of Claim 12. Additionally, the *Johnson-Oracle-Cline* and *Johnson-Peoplesoft-Cline* combinations are improper. Claim 12 is therefore allowable for at least these additional reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

iii. Claim 13

As another example, the Office Action also rejects Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Johnson* in view of *Oracle* and *Battat*. However, Claim 13 recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the business event message further includes a successor event and an expected time period for the successor event to occur, and further comprising:  
displaying a message for the successor event when the expected time period has been reached and the successor event has not occurred.

Essentially conceding that the proposed *Johnson-Oracle* combination fails to disclose each of these elements, the Office Action proposes combining *Johnson* and *Oracle* with *Battat*. In addressing Claim 13, the Office Action merely asserts that *Battat* “[teaches] an ‘event manager’ component and communications component and wherein the communications module can generate message about business events and time frame for the events.” Office Action, p. 14. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Office Action’s characterization of *Battat*, Applicant respectfully notes that this assertion fails to explain how *Battat* discloses any “successor event,” or “expected time period for the successor event to occur,” or any manner of “displaying a message for the successor event when the expected time period has been reached and the successor event has not occurred” (emphasis added), as recited in Claim 13. Thus, *Battat* fails to disclose additional element of Claim 13. Accordingly, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Battat* combination fails to disclose this additional element of Claim 13.

Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that Claim 13 includes “limitations [that] are considered as non-functional descriptive material (NFDM) on the data of ‘. . .’, thus having no patentable weight. The mere insertion of ‘reference event’ or ‘change event’ or ‘competition event’ data over ‘data’ does not ‘impart functionality when employed as a

computer component’, thus having no patentable weight.” Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 13 does not recite any “reference event,” “change event,” or “competition event.” Moreover, to the extent that the Office Action is alleging that additional elements of Claim 13 include “non-functional descriptive material,” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully notes that “[n]on-functional descriptive material includes but is not limited to music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.” M.P.E.P. § 2106.01. The Office Action has provided no evidence that the subject matter of any claim limitations includes “non-functional descriptive material.”

Thus, the proposed *Johnson-Oracle-Battat* combination fails to teach, suggest, or additional elements of Claim 13. Claim 13 is therefore allowable for at least these additional reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 13.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant  
(214) 953-6452



Todd A. Cason  
Reg. No. 54,020

Date: July 22, 2009

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number: **05073**